

SOUTHERN IDAHO WILDLIFE MITIGATION

9505700

SHORT DESCRIPTION:

Continue implementation of measures identified in the South Fork Snake/Palisades Wildlife Mitigation Environmental Assessment; implement measures identified through interagency planning for Remaining Palisades, Anderson Ranch, Black Canyon, and Minidoka consistent with the programmatic Wildlife Mitigation EIS (BPA 1997). Protect habitats through acquisition and easements, enhance wildlife habitats on public lands.

SPONSOR/CONTRACTOR: IDFG-SBT

Idaho Department of Fish and Game AND Shoshone-Bannock Tribes

Jerome Hansen and Shaun Robertson, Interstate Resource Data Coordinator and Wildlife Mitigation Coordinator

600 S. Walnut, P.O. Box 25 and Fisheries Dept., P.O. Box 306, Boise and Fort Hall, ID 83707, 83203

208/334-3098, 208/238-3758 jhansen@idfg.state.id.us, sroberts@601aol.com

SUB-CONTRACTORS:

Idaho Department of Fish and Game and The Shoshone-Bannock Tribes are JOINT SPONSORS

GOALS

GENERAL:

Supports a healthy Columbia basin, Maintains biological diversity, Maintains genetic integrity, Increases run sizes or populations, Provides needed habitat protection

WILDLIFE:

Habitat

NPPC PROGRAM MEASURE:

11.3D.4;11.3D.5;11.3D.7;11.3D.8

RELATION TO MEASURE:

Continues ongoing implementation of wildlife mitigation activities for the South Fork Snake and Remaining Palisades projects, Camas Prairie-Anderson Ranch project, Black Canyon-Bruneau project, and Minidoka project.

BIOLOGICAL OPINION ID:

Interim Wildlife Agreement

OTHER PLANNING DOCUMENTS:

FS/BLM Snake River Activity/Operations Plan (1991), IDWR South Fork Basin Plan (1997), IDWR Henrys Fork Basin Plan (1991), USFWS Pacific Bald Eagle Recovery Plan (1986), IDFG Wildlife Management Area Plans (1997), Forest Plans (Draft Targhee NF Plan, Boise NF Plan), BLM Resource Management Plans (Medicine Lodge RA, Pocatello RA, Bruneau RA, Cascade RA), IDFG Conservation Strategy for Henrys Fork Basin Wetlands

TARGET STOCK

LIFE STAGE

MGMT CODE (see below)

Ringneck pheasant

Sharp-tailed grouse

Blue grouse

Sage grouse

Ruffed grouse

Black-capped chickadee

Yellow warbler

River otter

Mink

Canada goose

Mallard
Elk/Mule deer
Wintering bald eagle
Breeding bald eagle

AFFECTED STOCK

Golden eagle, osprey, other raptors
Moose
Trumpeter swan
Inland native fish (cutthroat trout species, bull trout)

BENEFIT OR DETRIMENT

Beneficial
Beneficial
Beneficial
Beneficial

BACKGROUND

Stream name:

South Fork, Henrys Fork, and Main Snake River,
Blackfoot River, Portneuf River, Boise River, Payette
River, Bruneau River, Camas Creek

LAND AREA INFORMATION

Subbasin:

Snake

Land ownership:

combination of federal, state, tribal, and private

Hydro project mitigated:

Palisades, Anderson Ranch, Black Canyon, Minidoka

Acres affected:

5,000

Habitat types:

forested wetland, scrub-shrub wetland, emergent wetland, shrub-
steppe, sagebrush-grassland, aspen, coniferous forest, pasture-
agriculture, riverine

HISTORY:

Construction of Palisades Dam was completed in 1958 impacting 18,565 acres of wildlife habitat, including the 15,600 acre reservoir. The Palisades Wildlife Loss Assessment, completed in 1985, estimated 37,068 Habitat Units were lost. The Palisades Wildlife Mitigation Plan was completed in 1986, with the South Fork Snake project ranked as one of the highest priority projects in the Columbia Basin by the Wildlife Scoping Group. The South Fork Snake Programmatic Management Plan was completed in 1993, and a Final Environmental Assessment for the project was released in October 1995. The Remaining Palisades mitigation was incorporated into the NPPC's wildlife program in 1995.

Anderson Ranch Dam was completed in 1950, inundating 4,740 acres of wildlife habitat along the South Fork Boise River. The 1986 Anderson Ranch Wildlife Impact assessment estimated 9,620 Habitat Units were lost. The Anderson Ranch Wildlife Mitigation Plan was completed in 1987, with the Camas Prairie project the highest priority. Implementation planning, including work on a draft E.A. began in 1993 for the Camas Prairie project. The Camas Prairie project has been in the NPPC's wildlife program for a number of years.

Black Canyon Dam on the Payette River was completed in 1924, impacting 1,100 acres of wildlife habitat. The Black Canyon Wildlife Impact Assessment, completed in 1986, estimated 2,230 Habitat Units were lost. A Wildlife Mitigation Plan for Black Canyon was completed in 1987, with the Bruneau River project as the highest priority. The Black Canyon/Bruneau project was incorporated into the NPPC's wildlife program in 1995.

Construction of Minidoka Dam was completed in 1909, impacting over 12,000 acres of wildlife habitat. The Minidoka Dam Wildlife Impact Assessment, completed in 1989, estimated 5,374 Habitat Units were lost. The Minidoka Wildlife Mitigation Plan was completed in 1991, with the two preferred projects being riparian/river protection and enhancement and the South Hills shrub-steppe protection and enhancement. Minidoka was incorporated in the NPPC's wildlife program in 1996.

Implementation of Remaining Palisades, Anderson Ranch, Black Canyon, and Minidoka mitigation is anticipated to begin in 1997 upon completion of the Programmatic Wildlife Mitigation EIS. Local stakeholders, including landowners, interested publics, and other government agencies have long been involved in developing these projects and are expecting implementation to continue. Although many implementation opportunities were missed in the past ten years, ample opportunities remain to protect important cottonwood forest ecosystems along the South Fork, Henrys Fork, and mainstem Snake River, as well as other key riparian and upland habitats in the upper Snake River basin. As South Fork Snake habitat protection and enhancement projects are implemented in 1996-97 a proportion of 1998 funds will be necessary for operation and maintenance.

BIOLOGICAL RESULTS ACHIEVED:

We are near closing on several conservation easements and acquisitions, and are set to begin implementation of a habitat enhancement of public lands project in the South Fork Snake corridor. Together these projects will provide nearly 2,000 Habitat Units towards Palisades mitigation. We currently have active cooperation from a number of landowners, agencies, and organizations interested in conservation easements, selling land in fee-title, and habitat enhancement projects.

PROJECT REPORTS AND PAPERS:

Palisades: Wildlife Impact Assessment, 1985. Wildlife Protection, Mitigation and Enhancement Plan, 1986. South Fork Snake River Programmatic Management Plan, Implementation Phase I, 1993. South Fork Snake River / Palisades Wildlife Mitigation Project, Final E.A. and FONSI, 1995. South Fork Snake / Sand Creek, Progress Reports. Anderson Ranch: Wildlife Impact Assessment, 1986. Wildlife Protection, Mitigation and Enhancement Plan, 1987. Anderson Ranch Wildlife Mitigation Project draft EA, 1996. Camas Prairie/Anderson Ranch Progress Reports. Black Canyon: Wildlife Impact Assessment, 1986. Wildlife Protection, Mitigation and Enhancement Plan, 1987. Minidoka: Wildlife Impact Assessment, 1989. Wildlife Protection, Mitigation and Enhancement Plan, 1991.

ADAPTIVE MANAGEMENT IMPLICATIONS:

Previous management plans and NEPA documents addressed a restricted geographic area which limited our ability to take advantage of available opportunities. Through the expanded geographic scope and state-tribal cooperation on this project, we will be able to more effectively protect habitats in the larger ecological context of the upper Snake basin. The expanded project scope will also allow greater flexibility to secure properties as they become available. We are working closely with other land management agencies and organizations involved with conservation practices on private lands, and will focus our efforts on properties adjacent to existing public land or lands in conservation easements. In this manner, the mitigation efforts will be integrated with other land management efforts geared towards wildlife habitat conservation.

In general, we have found the interagency work group process to be of tremendous value to coordinate the wildlife mitigation program with other wildlife and natural resource management programs. We have found that coordination/cooperation with local interest groups and governments is critical to building support for the wildlife mitigation program. Unfortunately, some publics have become disillusioned by the long delays between planning and implementation. Mitigation plans that have been on the shelf for nearly a decade became somewhat obsolete. Implementation through this consolidated project should occur more efficiently due to cooperative efforts of multiple agencies working together on numerous but related projects in the upper Snake basin.

PURPOSE AND METHODS

SPECIFIC MEASUREABLE OBJECTIVES:

Ongoing implementation of the highest priority South Fork Snake project is anticipated to provide to over 1,000 Habitat Units (HUs) in FY98, primarily for bald eagle. This would be accomplished through protection of approximately 500 acres in a conservation easement, 400 acres of fee-title acquisition, and 200 acres of habitat enhancements on public lands.

Implementation of the remaining Palisades projects in FY98 is anticipated to provide nearly 1,000 HUs, primarily for elk/deer and other upland species. This would be accomplished through fee title acquisition of about 2,000 acres in the vicinity of Tex Creek, Sand Creek, and areas near the Fort Hall Reservation. Additional HUs could be gained with habitat enhancements once the property is protected.

Anderson Ranch implementation in FY98 is anticipated to provide 1,900 HUs through the protection and enhancement of 1,400 acres in the Camas Prairie adjacent to the Centennial Marsh WMA.

Black Canyon implementation on FY98 is anticipated to provide 375 HUs through the protection and enhancement of 400 acres near the Boise River WMA (Boise Foothills project).

Implementation activities for Minidoka in FY98 are anticipated to provide 40 HUs through the enhancement of 80 acres of upland habitat on public land.

CRITICAL UNCERTAINTIES:

Funding. Cooperating agencies, local interest groups, and landowners quickly lose interest in participating in the mitigation projects when we cannot assure them funding is available to implement the project. This also applies to long-term operation, maintenance, and monitoring. For the Minidoka habitat enhancement project, this project must be initiated in a year when water is available. If at all possible this project will be implemented in 1997 as there is ample water available this year. The situation in

1998 is unknown.

BIOLOGICAL NEED:

It was estimated that nearly 6,000 breeding and 18,565 wintering bald eagle HUs were lost with construction of Palisades Dam. The riparian habitats along the South Fork Snake River represent one of the largest remaining cottonwood ecosystems in the western U.S. The primary threat is recreational home development spilling over from the Jackson and Yellowstone area. Several key riparian parcels have been approved for high density recreational homesites (3-10 acre lots) in the past year. This results in fragmentation of the riparian corridor, increased human disturbance, and associated loss of bald eagle breeding and wintering habitat. Although much of the river corridor is currently under BLM management, there are a number of unprotected parcels which are likely to become available for acquisition or easement within the next several years. The South Fork project area already includes portions of the Henrys Fork and mainstem Snake River, however the expanded project area will enhance our ability to mitigate for bald eagle losses by including the cottonwood forest along the Snake River and tributaries in the Fort Hall Reservation area. Bald eagle numbers have been steadily increasing in the Upper Snake Basin, possibly indicating that the habitat protection measures implemented by other agencies in the past decade have been beneficial to species recovery. In recent years, the South Fork Snake has become one of the most productive areas for bald eagles in Idaho. Upland habitat mitigation projects will begin to address the loss of nearly 2,500 elk/deer HUs. Existing big game winter ranges are steadily being lost to home developments and conversion to cropland. Considering the projected population growth in Idaho in the next decade, it has become critical to protect and enhance the remaining winter ranges.

Anderson Ranch: An estimated 9,620 HUs were lost as a result of Anderson Ranch Dam and the highest priority sites for mitigation are the Camas Prairie and Bennett Hills. The Camas Prairie is a mosaic of high prairie and sagebrush steppe with desert springs and wet meadows along meandering creeks., and intensive use over the last 140 years has homogenized the native diversity. About 25 species of plants and animals with special status occur in the area. The marsh is an important stopover for migratory birds and the prairie is a major staging area for over 25 species of raptors. Much of the prairie and marsh has been converted to agriculture, the creek's waters rechanneled and diverted for irrigation, and the creek banks damaged by livestock overgrazing. Over 3,000 acres of wetlands are already protected (Centennial Marsh Wildlife Management Area) but activities upstream impact the protected area. Mitigation activities upstream could significantly improve water flows through the marsh as well as restore wildlife habitat along the creek corridor. Resident fish have been absent from upper Camas Creek for decades, this project will enable us to restore resident fish habitat in Camas Creek. The mosaic of sagebrush steppe, aspen groves, and chokecherry thickets of the Bennett Hills and upper Camas Creek functions as a high-value birthing and foraging area for big game but has deteriorated from heavy livestock use. When protected and enhanced, the area also will provide excellent habitat for sharp-tailed grouse, mountain quail, and neotropical migrants. The Camas Prairie/Bennett Hills are about to undergo tremendous change; several wealthy landowners are planning to buy tens of thousands of acres in the area, Camas County was the 45th fastest growing county in the U.S. 1994-95, and two wealthy movie-stars bought a local ski area and are planning to develop.

Black Canyon: An estimated 2,230 HUs were lost as a result of Black Canyon Dam and Reservoir, and the highest priority sites for mitigation are the Boise Foothills and the Bruneau River Valley. The Boise Foothills, adjacent to the fast growing city of Boise, are under immediate threat from home development. Ten thousand additional homes are planned in the Foothills. The Foothills are home to a great diversity of bird, mammal, and herp species, and provides critical big game winter range. A portion of the Foothills is already protected in the Boise River Wildlife Management Area. Several species of raptors migrate through and bald eagles winter along the Boise River and feed in the adjacent Foothills. There are also several rare endemic plants in the Foothills. The Foothills were severely burned in 1996, impacting the native plant populations. The sets the stage for further invasion of cheatgrass, medusahead, and other non-native species, and exacerbates the risk of increased fire frequency. The Bruneau Valley project would protect and enhance key riparian habitat along the Bruneau River, Jacks Creek, and other nearby tributaries of the Snake River. portions of the riparian, riverine, and upland areas are currently in somewhat degraded condition due to poor grazing practices. The area is also threatened by subdivision and home developments as the nearby Mountain Home Air Force Base is expecting 700 additional families to move in over the next two years. Portions of this project are likely to be adjacent to the existing C.J.Strike Wildlife Management Area, thus expanding an area currently managed for wildlife habitat. The Bruneau Valley project would protect habitat for bald eagle, sharp-tailed grouse, redband trout, and may indirectly benefit the Endangered Bruneau hot springs snail.

Minidoka: Implementation of a small habitat enhancement project at the IDFG Cottonwood Wildlife Management Area would begin to address the losses of 3,755 sage grouse and 3,413 mule deer HUs. The area to be enhanced with native grass and shrub plantings is former cropland. California bighorn sheep would also benefit from this project. Indirectly, by putting the water right to beneficial use in 1997 or 1998, will allow more water to stay in Cottonwood Creek, which is normally dry below the main diversion point just above the project area. Thus long-term there will be some riparian habitat benefits as well.

HYPOTHESIS TO BE TESTED:

This is not a research project. Long-term monitoring of protection and enhancement projects will allow wildlife and land managers to gain a better understanding of wildlife-habitat relationships.

ALTERNATIVE APPROACHES:

Restoring flood flows in the upper Snake basin was considered in years past as an avenue to restore declining cottonwood forests. This approach was summarily rejected as it is beyond the scope of this program.

JUSTIFICATION FOR PLANNING:

N/A The planning and assessment phase of these projects has been completed. Site-specific project planning and coordination is ongoing.

METHODS:

This is a wildlife habitat protection and enhancement project, not a research project.

We will continue working with landowners to develop mutually agreeable conservation easement terms. Landowners will be compensated for the fair market value of the easement, based on federally qualified appraisals. Habitat Evaluation Procedures will be used to determine HU benefits of each site-specific project. We will also continue to explore opportunities to acquire lands for wildlife habitat. Local county commissioners and other local groups will continue to be coordinated with and kept informed on the status of all mitigation projects.

We will continue working with other agencies and local groups to implement wildlife habitat enhancement projects on existing public lands, tribal lands, or private lands in a conservation easement. Typical habitat enhancement activities include developing conservation plans compatible with wildlife habitat objectives for noxious weed control, fencing, plantings, thinning, prescribed fire, grazing, erosion control projects, and farming. We are working closely with the Bureau of Land Management, Natural Resources Conservation Service, county weed supervisors, local land trusts and conservation groups to implement the various mitigation projects.

PLANNED ACTIVITIES

SCHEDULE:

Planning Phase

Start 6/88

End 6/97

Subcontractor

Task South Fork Snake This project is in the implementation phase. Remaining Palisades: In conjunction with the Palisades Interagency Work Group, wrap-up implementation planning, adjust project priorities to reflect current conditions, ensure proposed projects are consistent with the Programmatic Wildlife Mitigation EIS. Anderson Ranch: Planning will be completed this spring with release of the Programmatic Wildlife Mitigation Final EIS and ROD. Black Canyon: In conjunction with the Black Canyon Interagency Work Group, wrap-up implementation planning, adjust project priorities to reflect current conditions, ensure proposed projects are consistent with the Programmatic Wildlife Mitigation EIS. Black Canyon: In cooperation with other agencies, acquire fee-title or conservation easements on approximately 400 acres near the Boise River WMA. Develop site-specific project plans for habitat protection and enhancement projects. Minidoka: In conjunction with the Minidoka Interagency Work Group, wrap-up implementation planning, adjust project priorities to reflect current conditions, ensure proposed projects are consistent with the Programmatic Wildlife Mitigation EIS.

Implementation Phase **Start** 4/97

End ongoing

Subcontractor

Task South Fork Snake: Secure habitat for bald eagle and other target species through conservation easements or acquiring land in fee-title. Involves coordination with project partners and local publics, developing site-specific proposals and plans, obtaining appraisals, developing conservation easement terms, negotiating price, completing required pre-project surveys, and preparing project for closing. Also, develop detailed habitat enhancement plans for existing public lands and mitigation parcels, coordinate with project partners to implement enhancement projects. Remaining Palisades: Cooperate with landowners and other project partners who have already expressed interest in participating in this program. Secure habitat for bald eagle, elk/mule deer, and other target species through conservation easements or acquiring land in fee-title. Involves coordination with project partners and local publics, developing site-specific proposals and plans, obtaining appraisals, developing conservation easement terms, negotiating price, completing required pre-project surveys, and preparing project for closing. Also, develop detailed habitat enhancement plans for existing public lands, tribal lands, and mitigation parcels, coordinate with project partners to implement enhancement projects. Anderson Ranch: In cooperation with other agencies, acquire fee-title or conservation easements on approximately 1,400 acres adjacent to the Centennial Marsh WMA. Site plans will be developed for each specific habitat protection and enhancement project. Habitat enhancements such as streambank restoration and willow plantings may begin on lands secured in 1997 Minidoka: Complete implementation of a sagebrush-grassland restoration project on the Cottonwood WMA. Coordinate with landowners and other agencies and organizations acquire conservation easements, lands in fee-title, and to implement riparian and upland habitat enhancement projects on public or tribal lands.

O&M Phase

Start 4/98

End ongoing

Subcontractor

Task South Fork Snake: Maintain perimeter fences, manage public access, control noxious weeds, and maintain habitat enhancements on parcels acquired through the mitigation program. Remaining Palisades: Maintain perimeter fences, manage public access, control noxious weeds, and maintain habitat enhancements on parcels acquired through the mitigation program. Anderson Ranch: Maintain perimeter fences, manage public access, control noxious weeds, and maintain habitat enhancements on parcels acquired through the mitigation program. Black Canyon: Maintain perimeter fences, manage public access, control noxious weeds, and maintain habitat enhancements on parcels acquired through the mitigation program. Minidoka: Maintain perimeter fences, manage public access, control noxious weeds, and maintain habitat enhancements on parcels acquired through the mitigation program.

PROJECT COMPLETION DATE:

2010 (based on current funding levels)

CONSTRAINTS OR FACTORS THAT MAY CAUSE SCHEDULE OR BUDGET CHANGES:

A critical constraint for implementing the Remaining Palisades, Anderson Ranch, Black Canyon, and Minidoka projects is timely completion of BPA's Programmatic Wildlife Mitigation EIS in spring 1997. Development of a workable process to deal with cultural resource issues will be critical to implement any enhancement projects which involve ground disturbance. When individual landowners are involved in this program, whether for fee-title acquisitions or conservation easements, projects must be completed in a timely manner or landowners may back out. There is also a risk that some acquisitions or easements will prove to be unworkable due to flawed titles or other unforeseen factors. The credibility of BPA, Idaho Fish and Game, and the NPPC Columbia Basin Wildlife Program would be at risk if funding does not allow us to follow through with implementation and long-term maintenance of mitigation projects.

OUTCOMES, MONITORING AND EVALUATION

SUMMARY OF EXPECTED OUTCOMES

Expected performance of target population or quality change in land area affected:

The upper Snake River subbasin is a large, complex riverine ecosystem with numerous land managers and management activities. This project is designed to address the protection of various habitat types over a large geographic area. The primary areas of emphasis within the larger project area were selected through intensive consultation with cooperating agencies and landowners. They have been identified as representing critical resources or habitat features that if protected, will serve to preserve and enhance the ecological integrity of the subbasin as a whole.

In addition, from our consultation with rural landowners and county representatives, we have identified a primary concern of these parties as the loss of open space and the prevalent agricultural base. This project encourages enhancement of these values.

providing consistency with adjacent land uses whenever feasible, while ultimately providing the habitat protection and enhancement benefits as the primary guiding objective. Cooperation regarding mitigation and adjacent lands management will foster collaborative management among numerous agencies and provide additional benefits outside of the primary mitigation properties (e.g. adjacent Bureau of Land Management lands).

Most of these benefits will occur immediately as a result of project implementation, and will continue through perpetuity. Some long-term and indirect benefits (i.e. restoration of native vegetation or restoration of migration corridors) will occur as certain habitat features are reestablished on the specific mitigation parcels.

Present utilization and conservation potential of target population or area:

All of the mitigation activities identified with this project will result in benefits to multiple target populations and/or habitat types. Consequently it is difficult to identify the present utilization and conservation potential of every species or land parcel. However, based upon interagency consultation, we assert that the probability of enhancing target species productivity is high on all parcels since they were selected based upon this criteria. In addition, the lands selected for mitigation actions were chosen based upon the limited availability of the habitat types they possess, the imminent danger of the property from impacts, or a similar compelling conservation necessity.

Current utilization of the target species and land types are varied throughout the project area. Non-game species are important for their contribution to the biological diversity, non-consumptive recreation, and potentially indicators of overall ecosystem condition. Further, these species may also be used as surrogates for a number of species which utilize similar habitats. These non-target species have other uses by the public. Game species are crucially important to the Tribes from a subsistence and ceremonial perspective and to the Idaho sportsman for direct consumptive recreational uses. Target species, such as mule deer, were selected based upon the current high use levels.

Land areas selected for acquisitions or conservation easements are a mix of healthy native habitat and areas currently in some form of agricultural uses. Where compatible with wildlife habitat objectives, agricultural uses on land in conservation easements would be allowed to continue. Enhancement activities will generally be implemented on lands that are in degraded condition but have good restoration potential. In all cases, we will primarily implement actions that return habitats to their full complement of potential natural vegetation or managing successional development towards a level more productive for wildlife habitat.

Assumed historic status of utilization and conservation potential:

Species with current high consumptive utilization (i.e. big game) have documented high historical use by both the Tribes and non-Tribal hunters. The historical status of non-consumptive species (i.e. yellow warblers) is unknown but is assumed to be low. However, these species may represent other species of high historical utilization. Habitat protection and enhancement activities will be based on the current and potential native vegetation forms. We will not be implementing broad type-conversion activities. In some cases, former croplands may be managed as wildlife food plots.

Long term expected utilization and conservation potential for target population or habitat:

Based upon the criteria used to select the high priority habitat parcels, the anticipated long-term conservation potential is poor from the perspective of availability of mitigation lands. In other words, the rates of development on these lands (e.g. cottonwood forests, winter range, wetlands) is exceedingly high. If this mitigation project is not implemented in a timely manner, many opportunities will be lost permanently. However, from the perspective of long-term conservation success, the potential is very high. If the identified lands are protected as planned, many key habitat features of the upper Snake basin will be protected and can be assured protection in perpetuity. We anticipated the utilization, both consumptive and otherwise, of the target species to continue to exceed resource availability. As we have seen over the last ten year planning period, demand for hunting and recreational opportunities have continued to exceed supply.

Contribution toward long-term goal:

The long-term goal of protecting the ecological integrity of the upper basin as a whole will have significant contributions from this project. Implementation of the proposed mitigation actions would protect the high priority habitat features and key areas identified by the interagency work groups as providing significant resources to the basin. Implementation of the project actions will also contribute to reducing the mitigation debt (habitat losses) that resulted from construction of the hydroelectric projects.

Indirect biological or environmental changes:

A number of the mitigation projects will result in either beneficial effects to non-target species or non-target resources/lands. For example, protection of key riparian/wetlands is anticipated to result in beneficial effects to water quality through reduction in sediment inputs, restoration of wetlands function, and improvement of floodplain-river interactions.

Physical products:

Implementation of the project in FY98 is anticipated to result in protection through conservation easement or fee-title acquisition of at least 4,700 acres of land, enhancement of at least 280 acres, and the provision of at least 4,315 HUs. However, these are estimates based upon the current situation which can change very rapidly due to fluctuations in market conditions or similar factors. We have attempted to design a project which provides sufficient flexibility to capture available projects within key areas identified. The final accounting of actual physical products produced will occur as the projects are implemented.

Environmental attributes affected by the project:

Each mitigation action within this project will affect a variety of environmental attributes. For example, acquisition of key wetlands/riparian areas are anticipated to affect riparian vegetation, water quality features, species use, and other variables. Other attributes, such as public use of resources, may be affected through applying certain management actions. These effects would clearly be dependent upon the type of management action and the method of implementation. Each would be described and addressed through application of a Habitat Management Plan which is required on the mitigation parcels.

Changes assumed or expected for affected environmental attributes:

In general (based upon research, implementation of other similar projects, etc.) we assume beneficial effects of the majority of environmental attributes as a result of this project. However, some perceived detrimental impacts may occur through the application of some actions. For example, restricting certain public uses (i.e. off road vehicle use during critical winter range periods) may result in perceived negative impacts to certain segments of the public.

Measure of attribute changes:

As described above, we anticipate 4,315 HUs to be provided by this project in FY98. The final accounting for actual products produced can only be detailed following implementation of the project.

Assessment of effects on project outcomes of critical uncertainty:

The project proposed throughout this document could not be implemented efficiently and as planned if the critical uncertainties mentioned above become insurmountable obstacles. Although there are some uncertainties regarding the actual number of HUs produced or the realized benefits to species production, these are not considered critical uncertainties. These questions will be addressed through site-specific HEP's and preparation of Habitat Management Plans which include a monitoring plan for the mitigation parcels. The Habitat Management Plan, required for each mitigation parcel, will address site-specific conditions and identify needs for assessing production uncertainties such as trends in target species populations.

Information products:

There are various planning products that will result from implementation of this project. On all projects, whether it involves protection through a conservation easement or acquisition of fee-title, or enhancement of existing public or tribal land, a Habitat Management Plan, including a monitoring and evaluation plan, will be developed. These will be followed with project completion reports, quarterly and/or annual reports, monitoring reports, easement compliance reports, etc.

Coordination outcomes:

This project will continue the effective interagency coordination process utilized to this point. It will also result in more effective coordination with private landowners and county representatives throughout the project area. As the entire project is a joint effort of the Shoshone-Bannock Tribes and Idaho Department of Fish and Game, the collaborative working relationship developing with this project could easily have a positive effect on other natural resource issues shared by the Tribes and state.

MONITORING APPROACH

The region should evaluate whether there is steady progress being made toward the protection and enhancement of wildlife habitat by evaluating the number of HUs protected or enhanced. Annual reports should sufficiently describe environmental and biological changes that are occurring as the projects develop. Effective follow-up with agencies and tribes on contractual obligation would also be required.

Provisions to monitor population status or habitat quality:

The Idaho Department of Fish and Game and The Shoshone-Bannock Tribes routinely monitor wildlife species populations through

gh annual surveys. Project staff will develop a monitoring and evaluation program as a component of the long-term management plans for all mitigation lands secured for the program.

Data analysis and evaluation:

Data resulting from the project will be analyzed and evaluated by project staff in coordination with the Palisades, Anderson Ranch, Black Canyon, and Minidoka Interagency Work Groups.

Information feed back to management decisions:

Principles of adaptive management will be used throughout the program. Annual programs of work and long-term management plans will be developed and revised as needed, and will incorporate the results of monitoring and evaluation.

Critical uncertainties affecting project's outcomes:

Through exchange of information with other member of the Wildlife Working Group and other natural resource agencies and conservation organizations who are conducting similar activities throughout the Columbia River Basin.

EVALUATION

Number of HUs protected or enhanced each year. Enhancement activities performed at each site. Number of local governments and publics aware and supportive of mitigation activities. Is the agency or tribe staying within budget? Agencies and tribes must demonstrate staying on task as per work statements developed for BPA.

Incorporating new information regarding uncertainties:

Any problems that arise will be presented to the respective Interagency Work Groups and CBFWA's Wildlife Working Group.

Increasing public awareness of F&W activities:

The local publics are continually made aware of progress on these projects through various interest group meetings, public open houses, county commissioner meetings, informational mailings, newspaper/newsletter articles, and local community events. As habitat areas are secured and enhanced for the public, an information and education program will be initiated and will include development of interpretive sites, signs, brochures, educational site tours, and production of audio-visual programs.

RELATIONSHIPS

RELATED BPA PROJECT

5501700 (Minidoka)
5501400 (Black Canyon/Bruneau)
9206000 (Camas Prairie/Anderson Ranch)
5519200 (Remaining Palisades)
9505700 (South Fork Snake/Sand Creek)

RELATIONSHIP

Incorporated into 9505700, Southern Idaho Wildlife Mitigation
Incorporated into 9505700, Southern Idaho Wildlife Mitigation
Incorporated into 9505700, Southern Idaho Wildlife Mitigation
Incorporated into 9505700, Southern Idaho Wildlife Mitigation
Incorporated into 9505700, Southern Idaho Wildlife Mitigation

OPPORTUNITIES FOR COOPERATION:

The SBT and IDFG have signed a cooperative wildlife mitigation agreement to facilitate implementation of the wildlife mitigation program in southern Idaho. We are currently working in partnership with several other agencies and organizations to implement mitigation projects. These include the Bureau of Land Management, Natural Resources Conservation Service, High Country Resource Conservation and Development Area, Teton Valley Land Trust, and local Soil Conservation Districts. A number of agreements have already been signed between the various entities and IDFG and/or BPA. These organizations have contributed countless staff hours to develop site-specific mitigation projects and assist with their implementation. The BLM has also cost-shared by covering appraisal costs, pre-acquisition survey costs, and closing costs. We are exploring additional partnership opportunities with The Nature Conservancy, Idaho Soil Conservation Commission, Henry's Fork Foundation, Ducks Unlimited, Rocky Mountain Elk Foundation, Pheasants Forever, Idaho Power, and local counties.

COSTS AND ETC

COSTS AND FTE

1997 Planned: \$3,000,000

FUTURE FUNDING NEEDS:

<u>FY</u>	<u>\$ NEED</u>	<u>% PLAN</u>	<u>% IMPLEMENT</u>	<u>% O AND M</u>
1998	\$3,450,000	10%	85%	5%
1999	\$3,511,446	1%	85%	14%
2000	\$3,230,970	1%	85%	14%
2001	\$2,857,976	1%	85%	14%
2002	\$3,500,000	1%	85%	14%

PAST OBLIGATIONS (incl. 1997 if done):

<u>FY</u>	<u>OBLIGATED</u>
1995	\$105,257

TOTAL: \$105,257

Note: Data are past obligations, or amounts committed by year, not amounts billed. Does not include data for related projects.

<u>FY</u>	<u>OTHER FUNDING SOURCE</u>	<u>AMOUNT</u>	<u>IN-KIND VALUE</u>
1998	BLM, Multiple Agencies, S. F. Snake Weed Com. (possibly), Rocky Mountain Elk Foundation	\$250,000	\$75,000 \$10,000
1999	BLM, Multiple Agencies, S. F. Snake Weed Com. (possibly), Rocky Mountain Elk Foundation		\$75,000 \$10,000
2000	BLM, Multiple Agencies, S. F. Snake Weed Com. (possibly), Rocky Mountain Elk Foundation		\$85,000 \$10,000
2001	BLM, Multiple Agencies, S. F. Snake Weed Com. (possibly), Rocky Mountain Elk Foundation		\$100,000 \$10,000
2002	BLM		\$100,000

OTHER NON-FINANCIAL SUPPORTERS:

Natural Resources Conservation Service, U.S. Bureau of Land Management, U.S. Forest Service, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, U.S. Bureau of Reclamation, Idaho Soil Conservation Commission, Local Soil Conservation Districts, Teton Valley Land Trust, Henrys Fork Foundation, South Fork Snake Watershed Coalition, Ducks Unlimited, Wyoming Game and Fish, The Nature Conservancy, Blackfoot River Watershed Coalition, Greater Yellowstone Coalition, Idaho Wildlife Federation, Mountain Home Environmental Advisory Board, Mountain Home Travel and Tourism Committee, Magic Valley Fly Fishing Club, Idaho Bird Hunters Inc., City of Boise, Trust for Public Lands.

LONGER TERM COSTS:

approx. \$25,000,000 to complete implementation; annual allocations may vary, \$3,000,000 per year would allow program to keep implementation on track. approx. \$1,000,000 annually for O&M after full implementation, would be less until then.
approx. \$1,000,000 annually for O&M after full implementation, would be less until then.

1997 OVERHEAD PERCENT:

Idaho Department of Fish and Game: 24.6% overhead on salary, fringe benefits, and operating. Shoshone-Bannock Tribes: 26% on salary and fringe benefits, none on operating.

HOW DOES PERCENTAGE APPLY TO DIRECT COSTS:

IDFG and SBT -- no overhead assessment on capital.

CONTRACTOR FTE: Idaho Department of Fish and Game: 2.8 FTE's Shoshone-Bannock Tribes: 1 FTE

SUBCONTRACTOR FTE: N/A